



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

beginning of the text of the *Historie* may be partly due to the use of a copy of No. 2, the first leaves of which were mutilated or misplaced. No. 4 = E is an often faulty reproduction of No. 3, of which no good of any kind can be said and which should be carefully guarded against.

No. 5 seems gradually to have lost reputation. For while the original compilers of the *Vocabolario degli Accademici della Crusca* had used it by the side of No. 1 and No. 3, in the fifth edition of 1863 only the latter two are specially cited. Jacques Charles Brunet in his *Manuel du Libraire*, etc., of 1862, Tome III, p. 1275, goes so far as to class it among the prints of the Testina that have '*très-peu de valeur*.' This investigation, I trust, has shown on the contrary that No. 5 is the only one among the five that can have any sort of value for the constitution of the text¹ and above all the only one by the aid of which the relation of the Testina to previous prints can be studied. No. 1 perhaps contains fewer ordinary misprints than any other, but it shows at the same time the most numerous intentional modernisations and deviations from No. 5 and therefore is by no means qualified to stand as the representative of the Testina in any question of text criticism. It has both the excellencies and the shortcomings of an old picture that at one time was touched up to suit the taste of a younger owner.

(To be continued).

A. GERBER.

Wiesbaden.

BEOWULF 30, 53, 132, 2957. I.

penden wordum wēold wine Scyldinga,
lēof land-fruma, lange āhte. 30 f.

In a most kind and helpful review of my translation of *Beowulf*—the justice of his corrections in the main I gratefully admit—Professor Klaeber

¹ The value of T 5 for a constitution of the text is limited by the fact that it rests solely on previous prints of very different merit and not on any manuscript authority. In cases, however, where the latter is scarce or wanting the sometimes very bright emendations of T 5 should not be left unheeded.

recently (*Anglia Beiblatt*, 16, 225) dissented from my rendering of these lines, with the comment that "whatever our interpretation of line 31 may be, *wordum wēold* is 'wielded his word' (W. Morris)." This certainly is one possible interpretation, providing the ms. reading is accepted. But should it be?

The ms. reading may well be preferred to a baker's dozen or more of the many emendations or interpretations which have been offered. Professor Kock (*Anglia*, 27, 221–223) has summarized a number of these: Thorpe and Grein, *āhte* used absolutely; Bugge, place line 31 after 32; Heyne-Socin supply *geweald*, as object of *āhte*, out of *wordum wēold*; Rieger, read *līfe* for *leof*; Kluge, *lændagas* or *land* for *lange*; Lübke, *land* for *leof*; Cosijn, *lange þrāge* (cf. 54) for *lange āhte*; Trautmann, *langre āhte*, the long possession; Sievers (*Beiträge*, 9, 136), *lacuna*. Kock himself proposes *lān geāhte* (cf. *lān* in *lānlade*, *Codex Dipl.*, ed. Kemble, 3, 165. 52, perhaps originally *læn* as in *lænland*, *læne līf*, *lændagas*; *geāhte*, not in Bosworth-Toller but recorded in Ælfric's *Homilies*, Sweet's *Reader*, p. 65, l. 122). *Lange* occurs at the end of the line in the ms., and Kock contends the *ge* should be read with *āhte* in the next line (cf. *mange| þēon*, same page, and *nege|feah*, second next page).

A suggestion of Professor Sievers, later than that summarized above, which he urges apparently with conviction (*Beiträge*, 29, 308), is that *wordum wēold* should be translated "der worter wol-tete," adding "d. h. nicht etwa 'der gebote waltete,' d. h. 'befahl, regierte' (so z. b. noch Heyne-Socin,⁶ 285), sondern wörtlich 'als er noch sprechen konnte,' d. h. kurz vor seinem tode (damit wäre denn auch zugleich die änderung von *lange āhte* in *lange þrāge* abgelehnt, an die ich selbst einmal Beitr. 9, 136 zweifelnd gedacht hätte; vgl. auch Cosijn, *Aant.* 1.) Die stelle erinnert dann an *meaht þū meðel-cwidum worda zewealdan?* Guthl., 989, 'kannst du noch sprechen,' von einem todkranken . . . und, wenn auch etwas entfernter an solche wie . . . *swā hē latē meahte elnes uncýðiz areðe zewealdan* Guthl. 1199, und ähnlich *þeah hē late meahte . . . oreðe zebrēdan* ib. 1138."

Though some of these emendations are suggestive, none are satisfactory. Kock's is as im-

possible as Kluge's. The interpretation of Sievers, apart from other considerations, leaves l. 31 unexplained, and it is impossible, moreover, to see how the two lines could ever be brought into accord, if l. 30 is explained as he explains it—barring such an emendation as Kock's with its use of **lān* (or *læn*) in so violent a pregnant sense.

It would, of course, be desirable to leave the MS. unaltered, but no possible expenditure of ingenuity seems able to provide a satisfactory interpretation. The only constructions possible would seem to be: (1) *wēold* intransitive, *wordum* instrumental; (2) *wordum* object of *wēold*; (3) *āhte* used absolutely; (4) *āhte* with implied object, either *geweald* from *wēold* or *land* from *land-fruma*. As regards (1) there is no difficulty in assuming that *wēold* is used intransitively; cf. *gif hē wealdan mōt*, 442. The use of the instrumental *wordum* with it must be justified, however; for this see below. As regard (2), setting aside Sievers's interpretation as inadmissible, there remains what I suppose to be Klæber's view, namely that the phrase means "wielded words," irrespective of a particular time, i. e., "made use of words," in quasi-figurative analogy to "*wæpnum wēold*." When (2) in this interpretation is taken with (3) or (4), parallelism involves an awkward juxtaposition of ideas, "wielded his words, held possession—or possessed the land"—"held sway" must be excluded as involving zeugma, if *wēold* is taken in this sense, or an impossible pregnant use of *āhte*. Moreover, it may be confidently urged (a contention that applies to this interpretation but with still greater force to that of Sievers) that the poet would have written *penden hē wordum wealdan mōste*; cf. *penden hīe þām wæpnum wealdan mōston*, 2038; *penden hē burh-welan brūcan mōste*, 3100. With (3) and (4), we reach the fundamental difficulty. The use of *āhte* absolutely or with an implied object is, as Kock says in correction of Heyne-Socin, not supported by similar constructions in the poem.

If the MS. reading is not preserved, it is plain that the fact that there is a difficulty in each line (for *wealdan* in intransitive use is unusual) points to a resolution of these difficulties by taking the lines together. One emendation which does this is that on which my translation was based. It

was proposed by Professor Bright in 1895 (*Modern Language Notes*, 10, 85), who reads:

*penden wordum geweald wine Scyldinga,
lēof land-fruma, lange āhte.*

Bright notes March's *wordonweald* (*Anglo-Saxon Reader*, p. 88) as not far astray; also Heyne's suggestion to supply *geweald* as an object for *āhte* from *wordum weold*. Bright's emendation, through his change of *wēold* which brings *geweald* into the text, is a substantial advance upon these suggestions. It has not merely the *ad hoc* merit of meeting and disposing of all the difficulties of the passage, but approves itself when tested from every point of view.

Bright refers to the frequent use of *geweald* with *āgan* and uses in illustration *Orosius*, p. 288, ll. 9, 10, *þæt hē þæs ilcan rīces āhte geweald þe his wiðermanna ær āhte*. This passage is a close and interesting parallel, but it would have been well also to have cited the poem itself, *hē āh ealra geweald*, 1727, also 1088 b, and the excellent parallel (though with *habban* not *āgan* and with *word* in the genitive), *sē-þe his wordes geweald wīde hæfde*, 79.

A point in Bright's reading will be perceived, the construction of *wordum* as an instrumental, of which Klæber probably does not approve; whatever our interpretation of line 31 may be, *wordum wēold*, he says, is "wielded his word," a statement which involves rejection of the possible use here, as in 442, of *wealdan* as intransitive and therefore of *wordum* as an instrumental. But this construction need not be viewed with suspicion; the frequent use of *word* in the instrumental with verbs of saying, asking, greeting, praying, praising, teaching, offering, etc., might readily occasion its use in reference to an act or function mentally pictured as involving the verbal delivery of commands or of judicial decisions. Moreover, in the present case, in the half-line immediately preceding, the word *bæd* is used, rendering the use of *wordum*, though in a subordinate clause, natural and possible (cf. *wordum bādon*, 176; that *biddan* here = 'pray' is immaterial). The passages cited by Sievers cannot be accepted as defining an exclusive application of the phrase; the necessity for its use in the sense "still could frame words" would be too infrequent. There

is no difficulty, further, in the use of the instrumental as compared with the genitive despite line 79, *sē- þe his wordes geweald wīde hæfde*. In this passage the context renders use of the genitive natural, as implying power over, as well as by, his words in choosing a name for the hall.

Not only does Bright's reading need no defence from the stylistic standpoint, but on the contrary the passage as amended falls under one of the most frequent types of rhetorical structure in the poem, $a + x, / x^1, + a$ (x, x^1 , indicating parallel clauses, $a + a$, a syntactic whole). The structure presented by the ms. reading, on the contrary, is one for which no precise parallel offers itself in the poem, which indeed makes use of but a few of its general type (*e. g.*, ll. 131, 180 ff., 484 ff.). The point has some force for the structure in question, $y + x, / x^1 + y$, is one that would have presented not the slightest difficulty, in managing the alliteration or otherwise, to the poet, had its use seemed to him effective or desirable. He does not use it, however, while that of the proposed reading occurs everywhere.

The ms. reading may be explained as due to accidental omission of *ge-* (as probably in 652a and 1783a), an omission which might readily occur owing to the frequent separation of the prefix from the word to which it belonged, and subsequent change of *wēald* to *wōld* (if the original indeed had not *eo* for *ea*). The question may here be answered why, if an emendation of the character proposed is under consideration, it should not possibly take the form *þenden worda geweald . . . lange āhte* instead of *wordum geweald* in order to accord with l. 79, *his wordes geweald wīde hæfde*. Apart from the difference of meaning already adverted to, a scribal error involving a change of *worda ge weald* (*weold*) to *wordum weold* is highly improbable, even supposing an unusually ill-written or illegible original.

(To be continued).

C. G. CHILD.

University of Pennsylvania.

THE UR-HAMLET PROBLEM.

Professor Cunliffe's reply to the article by Professor Jack on *Thomas Kyd and the Ur-Hamlet*—both of which appeared in recent issues of *The Publications of the Modern Language Association*¹—makes superfluous the detailed refutation which the present writer had projected. There is one point in Professor Cunliffe's counter claims, however, which deserves greater emphasis and another upon which I venture to suggest that direct evidence is wanting.

Professor Cunliffe, in summing up his own conclusions, directly reverses the views set forth by Mr. Jack, and declares:—

I. "That Nash had a dramatist or dramatists in mind in this paragraph.

II. It is perfectly clear that Nash knew of a Hamlet drama and this paragraph does throw some light upon its authorship."

My own view as to the two issues may be summarized thus:

I. Nash had in mind not merely one dramatist, but a group, "a sort"—Kyd being among the number.

II. The paragraph may serve as corroborative testimony, if all other evidence indicates Kyd's authorship of an *Ur-Hamlet*. Taken alone, however, it proves nothing definite on this point and does not make it entirely clear either that Nash knew of a Hamlet drama then, or that such a play was then in existence—the last two points being for our purposes identical.

I. The claim that Nash had in mind not merely one but a group, or type, of dramatists seems to the writer borne out by every consideration. There is always, in the first place, some argument *prima facie* in favor of accepting the more obvious interpretation of a passage, so that it would be natural to assume that if Nash used the plural forms here, it was because he had more than one person in mind. It is easy, of course, to multiply instances to which, for various reasons, such an assumption would not apply and the supporters of

¹ Professor Jack's article appeared in the issue for December, 1905, and Professor Cunliffe's reply in the following number, March, 1906.